



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL PROBLEMS. By *Achille Loria*. Translated from the Italian by John Leslie Garner. London: George Allen & Co., 1911. Pp. 156.

This is a series of popular lectures on contemporary social problems from a somewhat narrowly economic point of view. Professor Loria, as is well known, is an advocate of the sociological theory known as "economic determinism." According to him, "the sociological cosmos rests upon the economic element." "Under the most diverse phenomena of contemporary social life," he says, "the profound, the essential cause is some economic fact." It is from this point of view that he approaches the social problems of the present. Everything from death and disease to contemporary politics and religion receives its economic interpretation. The problems which the criminologist is interested in are especially due to economic conditions, Professor Loria tells us, and their solution must be sought through the change of those economic conditions. He finds that prostitution, suicide and alcoholism are all due to economic causes. "Crime," he says, "in its manifold forms, is essentially the product of economic factors." It is especially systems of land ownership, which, according to Loria, determine economic production and distribution, and so all other social conditions. The disappearance of free land, with the inevitable poverty and misery, which he thinks has been occasioned thereby, has given rise to the various forms of individual and social maladjustment.

Such are Professor Loria's views. They seem so extreme as to be scarcely worthy of serious criticism. Lombroso's discussion of the causes of crime would serve as a good antidote for Loria's extreme view. While Lombroso finds the causes of crime to be fundamentally biological, he very sensibly admits the influence of economic factors, but says that the importance of these factors is often overestimated. It may be noted that Professor Ferri has attempted to reconcile Loria's economic determinism with Lombroso's biological theory of crime by claiming that past bad economic conditions are the causes of that biological degeneration which Lombroso has demonstrated to exist so largely in the criminal class. But it must be added, unfortunately for Ferri's reconciliation, that modern biology offers no support for such a view. A safe conclusion is, therefore, that any such one-sided explanation of crime as Loria's is essentially unscientific.

University of Missouri.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD.

REVIEW OF RECENT INVESTIGATIONS IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF TESTIMONY.

[In the issue of the *Psychological Bulletin* of September 15 is a review of investigations in the "Psychology of Testimony," by Prof. Guy M. Whipple, the results of which have appeared in the literature of psychology within the past year. The review is quoted here in its entirety, with the permission of the editor of the *Psychological Bulletin*.—Ed.]

Relatively only a small amount of experimentation has been conducted during the past year upon the psychology of testimony. Binet,² indeed, who deserves credit for initiating the work in this field, speaks as if the earlier investigators had garnered substantially all the really

²Binet, A. Le bilan de la psychologie en 1910. *Année psychol.*, 1911, 17, v-xi.

BOOK REVIEWS

valuable fruits of experimentation, and as if there remained but sparse picking for the investigator of to-day. But how can this be so, we are tempted to inquire, when the problem of testimony in its relation to historical investigation has hardly been touched upon, and when the problem of adapting the results of the experimental study of testimony to the practical needs of jurisprudence still calls for solution?

We may note in the recent literature signs that the legal profession is showing greater readiness to consider the results of experimental psychology. Thus, Gmelin⁵ has presented in an interesting manner the points of contact between the psychology of testimony and legal practice, and has urged the prime need that every jurist should familiarize himself with the work of the laboratory. Duprée³ has published in a popular form an extremely good summary of the net results of the laboratory studies of report, while Gross¹, the eminent criminologist and jurist, declares that all testimony, from whatever source, ought to be investigated critically with the aid of the doctrines of "subjective criminal psychology," and suggests that experimentation may some day enable us to classify witnesses into groups (by age, sex, training, temperament, etc.), and to state for what sort of observation and report each of these groups presents peculiar gifts or defects, so that, in a specific case, given the type of witness and the type of event to be reported, we may be able to predict whether the witness can tell the truth, even if he wants to.

Aside from these general discussions of the relation of the psychology of testimony to law, we may note in the recent literature four chief queries: First, how important for practical application are the conclusions drawn from the standard picture-tests? Second, is the testimony of children as unreliable as has been claimed? Third, can the religious oath be set aside without appreciable loss of accuracy in testimony? Fourth, how great and of what order is the unreliability of the testimony of mental defectives?

Gross seriously questions the importance for law of the "discovery" in the laboratory of the possibility of classifying witnesses, by means of the picture-test, into those graphically (pictorially) minded and those not graphically minded. We can not, he says, argue from the outcome of this test to the grade of general intelligence of the witness, nor can we argue his ability to report correctly events that transpire in temporal sequence. For these reasons, Gross urges the extended use of the event-test in place of the picture-test, as being quite as simple to arrange, much more significant for the measuring of observation and report, and closer to the actual situation of the witness in court. Gerland,⁴ however, believes that the picture-test is significant for legal

⁵Gmelin, J. G. *Zur Psychologie der Aussage: ein Vortrag, mit einem Anhang; Zur gesetzlichen Beseitigung des Zeugeneids*. Hannover, 1909. Pp. 98.

³Dupree, E. *Le temoignage: etude psychologique et medico-legale*. *Rev. d. deux Mondes*, 1910, 55, 343-370.

¹Gross, H. *Zur Frage der Zeugenaussage*. *H. Gross' Archiv*, 1910, 36, 372-382.

⁴Gerland, H. B. *Zur Frage der Zeugenaussage*. *H. Gross' Archiv*, 1910, 39, 116-119.

BOOK REVIEWS

procedure, and that the test can be profitably carried out in court, both to test special ability to depict a scene and to test general ability to report.

Dr. Babinsky,¹ the expert German specialist in children's diseases, declares that children are the most dangerous of all witnesses, and demands that their testimony be excluded from court record wherever possible. Similar statements are made by Duprée. Gross, however, stakes his thirty years of experience in the court against the views of these physicians. He declares that a healthy half-grown boy is the best possible witness for simple events. He thinks that Baginsky may have been influenced by his professional contact with sick children, but that, more likely, he, like many another, has been led to generalize too hastily from a few instances of inaccuracy in children's testimony and without stopping to consider the equally numerous inaccuracies in the testimony of adults. Children, according to Gross, make different errors, but no worse ones than do adults. In some respects, *e. g.*, freedom from prejudice, erroneous interpretation, emotion, intoxication, etc., a child is better fitted than an adult to give accurate report. The present writer would suggest that the whole matter could be very simply cleared up by an appropriate experiment. Why not subject observers of different ages to a graded series of event-tests?

Duprée, briefly, and Gmelin, at length, inveigh against the use of the religious oath, on the ground that the oath is a relic of primitive conditions, and contrary to the spirit of modern civilization, that it neither increases the veracity of the honest, nor keeps liars from lying, nor lends intelligence to the mentally defective, and that its abolishment would make one more desirable step in the separation of church and state. A simple affirmation of the witness, supported by the control that would be exerted by a plain statement from the judge as to the punishment of perjury, would be just as effective in securing reliable testimony as the present religious oath.

A general account of the faulty testimony of defectives (the feeble-minded, epileptic, hysteric and insane) is contributed by Duprée, who warns emphatically of the peculiar danger that exists when the defect is latent or mild and unsuspected by the court. Especially interesting are cases of morbid confessions, and self-accusation (with or without the accusation of other innocent parties). Gregor² studied experimentally, by means of the picture-test, the reports of normal and of abnormal subjects under varying conditions of exposure and time-interval. Patients afflicted with various paralyses proved to be not appreciably poorer than normal subjects (nurses) when the conditions were favorable to report, but their reliability and their range of report fell off markedly and their resistance to suggestive questions was reduced when the conditions were unfavorable for report (long time-interval, interrogatory, etc.). Their defectiveness, in other words, is not so much in observation as in the recall and critical organization and formulation of what had been observed.

¹Babinsky, A. *Die Kinderaussage vor Gericht*. Berlin, 1910. Pp. 41.

²Gregor, A. *Beiträge zur Psychologie der Aussage von Geisteskranken*. *Monats. f. Psychiatr. u. Neur.*, 1910, 28, 290-304, 428-473.